

246 COMMENTARY ON MACAULAY'S
HISTORY

was the war against Turkey/ ^x That is true.
But the
explanation of the Emperor's conduct which
follows is
absolutely unfair.

He was dull and bigoted. His mind
misgave him that
the war against France was, in some sense, a
war against the
Catholic religion ; and the war against
Turkey was a
crusade. His recent campaign on the Danube
had been
successful. He might easily have concluded an
honourable
peace with the Porte, and have turned his
arms westward.
But he had conceived the hope that he might
extend his
hereditary dominions at the expense of the
Infidels. Visions
of a triumphant entry into Constantinople
and of a Te
Deum in Saint Sophia's had risen in his brain.
He not only
employed in the East a force more than
sufficient to have
defended Piedmont and reconquered
Lorraine ; but he
seemed to think that England and Holland
were bound to
reward him largely for neglecting their
interests and pur-
suing his own.²

Macaulay writes as if Austrian interests
alone were in-
volved in the war against Turkey ; as if the
defeat of the
Turks was not a European interest just as
much as the de-
feat of Louis XIV; as if Turkey was a weak,
decaying
power which aggressive neighbours were
plotting to par-
tition. The impression which he produces is
that the Tur-
key of 1692 was something like the Turkey of
1854. On
the contrary, during the seventeenth century
the Ottoman

Empire was still an aggressive, barbarous power, making a waste wherever its armies trod, the deadly foe of civilisation and Christianity, and strong enough seriously to endanger both. The Turks were still gaining ground at the expense of the Christians. Ever since the sixteenth century Turkish pashas had ruled at Buda, and all Hungary had been in their hands, excepting a strip on the north.

¹V_j 2213 (six).

^sV, 2213-14.